
THE
DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN
PLATFORMS.

1856

16

CAGE

E

425

. D36

. 1856

61

522

111

THE

Democratic and Republican Platforms.

[That the people of each State are the only source of all power in the State; that the respective States are sovereign and equal; that *as equals* they are the sole parties to a compact termed the *Constitution of the United States*; that it was made, as it declares, for the *United States of America*, and "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty." That the *Government of the United States* has *no power whatever* but that which the people of the respective States *delegated* to it. Thus the tenth article of the Constitution ordains that "the power *not delegated* to the *United States* BY THE CONSTITUTION, nor *prohibited by it* to the States, are RESERVED to the States respectively, or to the people."

These are among the well-settled principles of the Democratic party, and of Constitutional law. They are based on the fundamental principle of man's right to self-government, viz: That the people of every State and place have the inherent and inalienable right to govern *themselves* within that place. All experience has shown that as to every institution existing within a given place, the people of that place are the best judges of its fitness or unfitness.

Self-government does not rest on the *power* of the people, but their power rests on the superior ground that self-government is their *right*. If it were otherwise, then might would make right, the foundation of all tyranny. It was because of this inalienable right, that the people of the several States did not give to the Federal Government any power to interfere in their local or domestic affairs, but they retained or *reserved* that right to themselves. If then, this be an inherent and inalienable right of the *people* of the several States, why is it not also the inherent and inalienable right of the *people* of and within the several territories? If it be assumed, in reply, that the Federal Government has the mere *power* to govern the territories, yet it does not

follow that it should exercise it; for the same experience which has shown that this power will be best exercised by the *people* of a *State*, proves also that it would be best exercised by the *people* of a *territory*; but even if the Federal Government should exercise its power, and thus disregard the will of the people of the territories, yet they should not do it so as practically to exclude from them one class and section of the States and people of the Union. For as the several States are sovereign and equal, and the Federal Government is but their agent, to execute their joint will, it should govern their common property for their common benefit. It should not establish or unduly favor the institutions of the Southern States, to the exclusion or prejudice in the slightest degree of the institutions of the North; nor should it seek to propagate those of the latter to the exclusion of those of the former. In reference to these domestic institutions, the one section may be right, and the other therefore wrong; but the Southern and Northern States did not delegate to the Federal Government the power to decide that question between them. They reserved that to themselves; and even as to their *common property*, they agreed that it should be held and governed only for their *common good*. The *property* of the States is to be thus administered by their agent; but the States did not delegate to the Federal Government, nor can it find in the Constitution any authority to found social or political institutions for the *people* within the territory. The *Federal* Government has neither the power to establish domestic institutions for the people of a territory, nor to abolish them, nor to ordain that the people themselves shall not establish or abolish them, according to their own free will and pleasure.

We of Pennsylvania once instituted and maintained slavery; but convinced that it was wrong, we gradually abolished it; but we did not, nor would we permit any other State to dictate to us, or to interfere with our own free choice upon the subject. Other States continue to differ from us, but we shall not dictate to them, or intermeddle with their domestic concerns. The people of this State have an equal right with those of the other States, to emigrate to the territories of the United States. We would not suffer the citizens in any Southern or Northern State—no, nor the Federal Government itself—to prescribe to them what domestic institutions they should or should not live under; nor will we, therefore, do to others what we would not suffer to be done to us. Do we, then, desire to see the extension of slavery? We answer that we do *not*.

We hope and believe that the day will yet come when those who legalize slavery now, as we once did, will themselves, and of their own free will, do as we ourselves did—abolish it.

Those of us who are of one religious denomination, may not desire to see the creed or tenets of another denomination introduced or extended in any other State or territory; but should we therefore *prohibit* other people from adopting them? Or would our *non-interference* be evidence that we favored their propagation and extension? Assuredly not.

Then let it not be said that we in Pennsylvania are propagandists of slavery, because we will not prohibit people who are not of Pennsylvania from

adopting it. As citizens of Pennsylvania, we wish the territories to be free States. Were we inhabitants of them, we would vote to make them free; but neither as citizens of a State, or inhabitants of a territory, would we admit the right of the inhabitants of any other State or territory, nor of the Federal or State governments, to intermeddle with our domestic concerns. These, too, are the principles of the Democracy—not in a few States, or in one geographical section, but of the whole thirty-one States of the Union, viz: In both States and territories, such institutions as the free choice of their free citizens shall legally ordain and establish, and no dictation by Congress.

We publish the Democratic Platform, that it may be seen and known to maintain the equal rights of the States—whether North, or South, or East, or West—and equal and exact justice among all men, without regard to their birth-place or residence.]

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

Resolved, That the American Democracy place their trust in the intelligence, the patriotism, and the discriminating justice of the American people.

Resolved, That we regard this as a distinctive feature of our political creed, which we are proud to maintain before the world, as the great moral element in a form of government springing from and upheld by the popular will; and we contrast it with the creed and practice of Federalism, under whatever name or form, which seeks to palsy the will of the constituent, and which constitutes no imposture too monstrous for the popular credulity.

Resolved, therefore, That, entertaining these views, the Democratic party of this Union, through their delegates assembled in a general Convention, coming together in a spirit of concord, of devotion to the doctrines and faith of a free representative government, and appealing to their fellow-citizens for the rectitude of their intentions, renew and re-assert before the American people the declarations of principles avowed by them when, on former occasions, in general Convention, they have presented their candidates for the popular suffrages.

1. That the Federal Government is one of limited power, derived solely from the Constitution; and the grants of power made therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the Government, and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers.

2. That the Constitution does not confer upon the General Government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements.

3. That the Constitution does not confer authority upon the Federal Government directly or indirectly, to assume the debts of the several States, contracted for local and internal improvements, or other State purposes, nor would such assumption be just or expedient.

4. That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete and ample protection of persons and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression.

5. That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practise the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government, and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

6. That the proceeds of the public lands ought to be sacredly applied to the national objects specified in the Constitution; and that we are opposed to any law for the distribution of such proceeds among the States, as alike inexpedient in policy and repugnant to the Constitution.

7. That Congress has no power to charter a National Bank, that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of our country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power, and above the laws and the will of the people; and that the result of Democratic legislation in this and all other financial measures upon which issues have been made between the two political parties of the country, have demonstrated to candid and practical men of all parties, their soundness, safety, and utility, in all business pursuits.

8. That the separation of the moneys of the Government from banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds of the Government and the rights of the people.

9. That we are decidedly opposed to taking from the President the qualified veto power, by which he is enabled, under restrictions and responsibilities, amply sufficient to guard the public interest, to suspend the passage of a bill whose merits cannot secure the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, until the judgment of the people can be obtained thereon, and which has saved the American people from the corrupt and tyrannical domination of the Bank of the United States, and from a corrupting system of general internal improvements.

10. That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition law from our statute-books.

And whereas, Since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in National Conventions, an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively Ameri-

can, it is proper that the American Democracy should clearly define its relations thereto, and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called.

Resolved, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity, expansion, and pre-eminent example in free government built upon, entire freedom in matters of religious concernment, and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles, which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birth-place. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against the Catholics and foreign-born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

Resolved, That we reiterate with renewed energy of purpose, the well-considered declarations of former Conventions upon the sectional issue of Domestic Slavery, and concerning the reserved rights of the States :

1. That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that all such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution ; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences ; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friends of our political institutions.

2. That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress ; and therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the *Compromise Measures*, settled by the Congress of 1850 : "the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor" included, which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity thereto be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

3. That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

[The passage and maintenance of Missouri, or other geographical lines, by Congress, necessarily involved the right of Congress to legalize slavery on

one side, and *prohibit* it on the other side of such lines; and this without regard to the will of the inhabitants of the territories. To remove this agitating question at once and forever from the halls of Congress, the Compromise Bills of 1850 substituted a *political principle*, viz: the *free choice* of the people of the territories instead of a geographical line to be prescribed by the will of the members of Congress; and by those Compromise measures it was declared that this question should no longer be settled by *Congress*, but that thereafter, as then, the *people of the territories* should alone determine it for themselves.

Henry Clay, introduced, and in his report thus advocated that principle: "It is high time that the wounds which it (*the Wilmot Proviso*) has inflicted should be healed up and closed; and that to avoid in *all future time* the agitations which must be produced by the conflict of opinion on the slavery question—existing, as this institution does, in some of the States, and prohibited, as it is, in others—the true principle which ought to regulate the action of Congress in forming territorial governments, for each newly acquired domain, is to refrain from all legislation on the subject in the territory acquired, so long as it retains the territorial form of government, leaving it to the people of such territory, when they have attained to a condition which entitles them to admission as a State, to decide for themselves the question of the allowance or prohibition of domestic slavery."—(See Congressional Globe, May 10, 1850, page 945.)

Both the Democratic and Whig Conventions of 1852 affirmed and resolved to abide by that principle; and the former then resolved, that no efforts made to induce *Congress* to interfere should be countenanced. Of course, if *Congress* were not to interfere, then that duty devolved upon the *people of the territories*, and Congress was bound to provide for their right to do so, and when forming territorial governments for Kansas and Nebraska, they did so by the following clause of the Kansas and Nebraska Bill of 1854:—

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any *State or Territory*, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the *people* thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the *Constitution of the United States*."

The Democratic Convention of 1856 reaffirmed the same principle, and the very words just quoted, contain at this moment, as in 1852, the true doctrine on this point, of the whole Democracy of the Union, East and West, and North and South:—]

"4. That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature, in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import."

[The ALIEN Act of June, 1798, authorized the President to order out of the country all Aliens whom he might consider dangerous to the peace of the

United States—that if they did not go, they should, on conviction, be imprisoned three years, and never after allowed to become citizens—that, even when thus imprisoned, the President might send them out of the country, and if they returned, they should be imprisoned during the President's *will*. American-born citizens, as well as others, complained of this act and of the conduct of President Adams and the Federal Government, and to punish them Congress declared, in July, 1798, by an act known as the *SEDITION Act*, 1st, that if *any person* should unlawfully combine to oppose any measure of the government, or counsel any unlawful assembly with that intent, they should be tried by any Court of the *United States*—punished by a fine of \$5,000, and imprisoned for five years, and also find sureties for good behavior in such amount and for such time as the Court might direct. 2d, That if *any person* should write, utter or publish any false, scandalous and malicious writing against the Government, or either House, or the President, and to bring them into contempt or disrepute, they should be fined and imprisoned.

JEFFERSON, for *Kentucky*, and MADISON, for *Virginia*, drew resolutions protesting against these acts, and defining the power of the Federal Government—1. That the States acceded to a compact, styled a Constitution, only for the purposes and with the powers therein mentioned and delegated, and that they retained all others—that of every infraction of the compact, each State was the judge for itself—that no power over the freedom of religion, the press, or speech, nor over alien friends, more than citizens, had been delegated by the States, that these acts subjected the liberties and lives of the people to the arbitrary will of one man; that they subjected the people to imprisonment and banishment without oath or warrant, or trial or conviction, or judgment, and practically suspended the *habeas corpus* act; and that all these things were in open violation of the Constitution of the United States, and that said acts of Congress were *null and void*. These resolves were sent to all the other States. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, returned no reply; but the remaining States controverted these resolutions and defended the acts of Congress, upon the ground, among others, that, as the Constitution has *given to the States* no power to remove aliens during the period under consideration, and as it must rest somewhere, *therefore, Congress possessed it*.

It was on this *principle* that the Federalists and their successors maintained, and yet maintain, the power of the Federal Government to legislate and appropriate money about whatever concerns Learning, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Internal Improvements, Banks, Slavery in the Territories, and indeed, almost everything which Congress may fancy concerns the *general welfare*. But to this principle, so pregnant with danger, and on which Abolitionism now rests, and which is expressly embodied in the Fremont Platform, Mr. Madison replied—in his report of 1799—that the *States did not obtain their power from the Constitution or General Government*—but that the latter obtained its powers from the *sovereign States*—and that the contrary doctrine was new, and “*struck radically at the political system of America*.” He then proceeded to vindicate the doctrine of State Rights, and that the

several States and the people retained all power which they had not expressly delegated.]

“And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the North and South to the Constitution and the Union:—

“1. Resolved, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue: and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery, which seek to embroil the States and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories; and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion, the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the ‘slavery question’ upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN STATE AND TERRITORY OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

“2. This was the basis of the Compromise of 1850, confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in national conventions; ratified by the people in the election of 1852, and rightly applied to the organization of Territories in 1854.”

[Under the Compromise act of September 9, 1850, a territorial government was provided for NEW MEXICO, (extending North as well as South of 36° 30', viz: from 32° to 38°) and it “provided further, that when admitted as a State, the same shall be received into the Union, WITH or WITHOUT slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission.”

By the same Compromise act of September 9, 1850, a territorial government was provided for UTAH, bounded on the South by the thirty-seventh degree of North latitude, and therefore all North of the Missouri Compromise line; and said act declared that, “when admitted as a State, the said territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union WITH or WITHOUT slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission.”

What is called the Missouri Compromise, prohibited slavery in territory North of 36° 30', but allowed the people to establish it or not, as they pleased, in all of the territory south of that line; but the Compromise measures of 1850, allowed slavery to be established in the free territory of Utah, which is all North of 36° 30', and also in the free territory of New Mexico, a part of which is North of 36° 30'. Did not these acts, therefore, conflict with, and supercede the rule prescribed by the Missouri Compromise? And if it was right to permit the natives of the free territories of

New Mexico and Utah to introduce or exclude slavery, why was it not right to permit American citizens, who may emigrate to the free territories of Kansas and Nebraska to do the same thing? The bill organizing these territories in 1854 was in the very words of the bills of 1850. It reads thus: "That when admitted as a State, the said territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their Constitutions may prescribe at the time of their admission."]

"3. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect, the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact; the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviolate; and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to its utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a republican form of government."

[In proof of this, remember that before 1848 the inhabitants of OREGON, of their free choice *prohibited slavery* therein. So too, in 1849, did the inhabitants of California, South as well as North of 36° 30'—and they did it unanimously—although the members who composed the convention 16 were natives, and had been residents, of *slaveholding States*.—(*Webster's Speech, March 7, 1850.*) Neither in *New Mexico, Utah or Nebraska*, has any attempt been made to establish slavery. Under popular sovereignty they will each become *free States*, as Kansas itself would, ere this, have been and yet will be, if it be left to the *bona fide* immigrants thereto. So that all the territories now owned by and equal, in area, to the 31 States, will, in time, be admitted as free States.]

"*Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly-expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.*

"*Resolved, finally, That in view of the condition of popular institutions in the Old World (and the dangerous tendencies of sectional agitation, combined with the attempt to enforce civil and religious disabilities against the rights of acquiring and enjoying citizenship in our own land,) a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the Union, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the Union of the States; and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the Constitution which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacities of this great and progressive people.*

"1. *Resolved*, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country which are inferior to no domestic questions whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, and by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

"2. *Resolved*, That our geographical and political position with reference to other States of this continent, no less than the interest of our commerce and the development of our growing power, requires that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine; their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction, and should be applied with unbending rigidity.

"3. *Resolved*, That the great highway which nature, as well as the assent of the States most immediately interested in its maintenance, has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, constitutes one of the most important achievements realized by the spirit of modern times and the unconquerable energy of our people. That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exertion of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be suffered to impede or clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our government and the government of the States within whose dominion it lies. We can, under no circumstances, surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

"4. *Resolved*, That in view of so commanding an interest, the people of the United States cannot but sympathize with the efforts which are being made by the people of Central America to regenerate that portion of the continent which covers the passage across the Inter-oceanic Isthmus.

"5. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will expect of the next Administration that every proper effort will be made to insure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico, and to maintain a permanent protection to the great outlet through which are emptied into its waters the products raised out of the soil, and the commodities created by the industry of the people of our Western valleys, and of the Union at large.

"*Resolved*, That the Democratic party recognizes the great importance, in a political and commercial point of view, of a safe and speedy communication, by military and postal roads through our own territory, between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of this Union, and that it is the duty of the Federal Government to exercise promptly all its constitutional power for the attainment of that object."

[Such is the *Democratic Platform*. The clauses printed in italics are the only ones which relate to slavery; and there is not in them or in the whole platform a *single word*, which favors the *extension* of slavery—there is *not a word* in it about the *propagation* of slavery—it expressly *denies* the right of Congress to *establish* or *extend* that institution—it takes the decision of the

whole matter from the Congress of the United States, where it has created nothing but agitation and mischief, and refers it to the *free choice* of the *free men* of the territories. That choice is their *right*, and *their right* the Democratic party will maintain. That, and that only, is their platform.]

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM,

Adopted at Philadelphia, June 18, 1856.

This Convention of Delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call addressed to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions; who are opposed to—(1.) The repeal of the Missouri Compromise; to the policy of the present administration; (2.) To the extension of slavery into free territory; (3.) In favor of the admission of Kansas as a free State; (4.) Of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson; and for the purpose of presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President—do resolve:

Resolved, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution, are essential to the preservation of our republican interests, and that the rights of the States must and shall be preserved. (5.)

Resolved, That, with our republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable right of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government were to secure [grant] (6.) these rights to all persons under its exclusive jurisdiction; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all (7.) our national territory, ordained that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of their Constitution, (8.) against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the Territories of the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence (9.) or extension therein.

That we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, of any individual, or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained. (10.)

Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress *sovereign* (11.) power over the territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery.

Resolved, That while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by the people, in order to form a more perfect Union, estab-

lish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, and secure the blessings of liberty, and contains ample provisions for the protection of the life, liberty and property of every citizen, the dearest Constitutional rights of the people of Kansas, have been fraudulently and violently taken from them—their territory has been invaded by an armed force—spurious and pretended legislative, judicial and executive officers have been set over them, by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced—the rights of the people to keep and bear arms have been infringed—test oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage and holding office—the right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied—the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures has been violated—they have been deprived of life, liberty and property, without due process of law—that the freedom of speech and of the press has been abridged—the right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect—murders, robberies and arsons have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished—that all these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction and procurement of the present administration, and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union and humanity, we arraign the administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists and accessories, either before or after the facts, before the country and before the world, and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious outrages and their accomplices to a sure and condign punishment hereafter.

Resolved, That Kansas should be immediately admitted as a State of the Union, with her present free constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are entitled, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her territory.

Resolved, That the highwayman's plea, that "might makes right," embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

Resolved, That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean, by the most central and practical route, is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country, and that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and as an auxiliary thereto, the immediate construction of an emigrant route on the line of the railroad.

Resolved, That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors, of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of our existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution, and justified by the obligation of government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

Resolved, That we invite the affiliation and co-operation of the men of all parties, however different from us in other respects, in support of the princi-

ples herein declared; and believing that the spirit of our institutions, as well as the Constitution of our country, guarantees liberty of conscience and equality of rights among citizens, we oppose all legislation impairing their security."

[This platform misapplies truth and asserts untruth. It contains principles self-contradictory and absurd, and as a rule of action it is disregarded by the party who made it.

1. It avows hostility to the *repeal* of the *Missouri Compromise*, and asserts that *all* our territory was made free. The latter is not true, and as to the former, this the platform *contradicts* itself. 1st. By that *Compromise Congress legalized slavery in all* our territory *South of 36° 30'*, in *consideration of its prohibition North of 36° 30'*; and yet this platform asserts that Congress has *no authority* to legalize it. If Congress *has* the power, then this platform asserts a falsehood. If it has *not* the power, then the Act of 1820, called a *Compromise*, was always *null and void*; and its so-called repeal can be no cause of complaint. 2d. This platform asserts the *power* of Congress to *legislate slavery out* of all territory. Now this admits their power *not* to legislate it out, but to legislate it into the same territory. On this point, Mr. Clay said in the Senate, May 15, 1850: "Allow me to ask him, sir, and the other Southern Senators, if with their views of what ought to be done on the subject of slavery [*i.e.* no power to *prohibit*] they can think it right that Congress by an express enactment, should *authorize* its introduction into these territories? Does not that power in virtue of which you would expressly provide for the *introduction* of slavery, *imply the converse* of the proposition, and the right to pass a law for the *prohibition* of slavery?"

* * The amendment of the Senator recognizes by an irresistible conclusion, the power of Congress to prohibit, as well as introduce, slavery into these territories."

Not only do the principles of this platform contradict each other, but the practice of the Republicans contradict their principles. In July, 1856, Mr. Dunn (Republican) offered, and the Republicans by a vote of 109 to 102, *approved of*, an amendment, which, after repealing the 14th and 32d sections of the Kansas and Nebraska Act: "provided, that any person or persons lawfully held to service within either of the territories (Kansas or Nebraska) named in said Act, shall be discharged from such service, *if* they shall *not be removed* and kept out of said territories *within twelve months* from the passage of this Act." That is to say, the owners of these slaves might *lawfully keep them in these territories* for 12 months, and then remove them, and keep them *for life out* of the territories! Mr. Dunn and his Republican friends went further, for on July 29, 1856, he called up his bill, section 24th of which repealed the 32d section of the Kansas and Nebraska Act, and then "provided however, that any person lawfully held to service in either of said territories, shall *not* be discharged from such service by reason of such repeal and revival of said eighth section if such person shall be permanently removed from such Territory or Territories, prior to the 1st day of January, 1858:

And any *child or children born in either of said Territories*, of any female lawfully held to *service*, if in like manner, removed without said Territories before the expiration of that date, shall *not* be, by reason of *anything in this Act*, emancipated from any service it might have owed had this Act never been passed." (*Vide* Greeley's History of Slavery, pages 147, 162.) This Act of Congress, *legalized slavery in the Territories*, and even made legal and valid the title to slaves when taken out of the Territories. If Congress has *no power* to legalize slavery, then these Republicans voluntarily and knowingly, in violation of the Constitution, and of their oath to support it, assumed that power, and for the purpose of enslaving men otherwise free; but if Congress has the power, then what becomes of their platform? In either case, their practice, contradicts their principles; they say one thing, and do its opposite. Observe, too, that in their platform they do *not* propose to *restore* the Missouri Compromise; neither do they pledge themselves to maintain that clause of the Ordinance of 1787, which provides for the *return* of *fugitive slaves*; nor the like provision in the Constitution of the United States, nor the fugitive slave law of 1850. They alike, disregard Ordinance, Constitution, Act of Congress, Compact and Compromise.

The Democratic party *denies* the power of Congress to establish slavery, and also its converse—that *they* can prohibit it; the *Republican party*, *admits*, may invoke, the power of Congress to prohibit it, and hence, *admits* also the power of Congress to establish it, and therefore on their *own principle*, the South may invoke Congress to establish it. 3d. It is not true as this platform implies, that the Abolitionists maintained the Missouri Compromise. On the contrary, Whigs and Democrats only maintained it, till driven by Abolitionists to substitute for it another principle. These are the facts respecting free Territory and that Compromise.

In 1783, slaveholding Virginia gave to the Old Confederation, the whole Territory Northwest of the Ohio, and being all North of 36° 30', for the common benefit of all the States; and in 1787 they unanimously engaged to exclude slavery therefrom. By Article V. of the Constitution of the United States, all engagements entered into by the old States were made valid, hence the 1st Congress *continued* this *compact*, excluding slavery. They made no *new* prohibition, or law on that subject.

On August 9, 1787, South Carolina ceded to Congress, and they accepted for the *common benefit* of the *Union*, the territory within the river Mississippi and a line at that part thereof intersected by the Southern boundary of North Carolina, thence along said line till it intersects the ridge of mountains dividing the Eastern from the Western waters, thence along said ridge till it intersects a line, drawn due West from the head of the Southern branch of the Tugoloo river to said mountains, thence due West to the Mississippi. (1 Bioren and Duane's Laws, p. 487.) In this territory slavery existed in 1787, and yet it was never abolished therein.

2. In 1790, *North Carolina* ceded to the *United States*, and the First Congress, on April 2, 1790, accepted the *territory*, since admitted as the State of *Tennessee*, under this express agreement: "Provided always, that *no regula-*

tions made, or to be made by Congress, shall tend to emancipate slaves."—1 U. S. Statute, p. 108.

3. May 26, 1790, Congress passed an act for the government of "the *territory* of the United States *South* of the river Ohio," similar to that for the government of the Northwest, &c. "EXCEPT so far as is *otherwise provided* in the conditions expressed in an act of Congress of the present session, entitled "An act to accept a session of the claims of the State of North Carolina to a certain district of Western territory," viz: that no act of Congress should tend to emancipate slaves in this territory.—(1 U. S. Statute, p. 123.)

February 12, 1793, Congress passed, and Washington approved an act requiring that fugitive slaves held in and escaping from any *State* or *Territory*, *Northwest* or *South* of the Ohio, should be surrendered and returned to their owners.

April 7, 1798, Congress passed an act for the government of the *Mississippi Territory*, (that *south* of the Ohio) similar to that for the *Northwest*, "*excepting* and *excluding* the last article of the ordinance (of 1787,) made for the government thereof." (1 U. Statute, p. 549.) Thus they expressly refused to prohibit slavery in this territory.

April 24, 1802, Georgia ceded to the United States, certain territory south of Tennessee, for the common benefit of the Union, and extending thereto the Ordinance of 1787—"that Article only *excepted* which forbids slavery." (1 Bioren and Duane's Laws, p. 490.

March 26, 1804, Congress passed an act dividing the territory they acquired from France in 1803, into two territorial governments. In the one called *Orleans*, since admitted as the *State of Louisiana*, they *expressly legalized* the *introduction of slaves* from any place not out of the United States. In the other called *Louisiana*, they *continued* the laws then in force, (which legalized slavery.)—2 U. S. Statute, p. 283.

March 2, 1805, Congress passed an act, the 5th section of which declared that "the *sixth article* of compact (that prohibiting slavery,) which is *annexed* to, and makes part of said ordinance (of 1787,) are hereby declared *not* to extend to, but are *excluded from all operation* within the said territory of Orleans."—2 U. S. Statute. p. 322.

June 4, 1812, by an act of Congress, the territory named Louisiana, was then named and was afterwards called Missouri Territory. Section 16, *expressly continued* the laws then in force, (and which legalized slavery,) till altered by the General Assembly of the *people*.

This *Missouri* Territory included the future *State of Missouri* and the present territories of *Kansas* and *Nebraska*, and was then slave and not free territory. Thus matters continued till 1820, when the people of *Missouri*, being North of 36° 30', made a Constitution which allowed slavery, and applied for admission as a *State*. The *House* agreed to admit her as a *State*, but by a purely *Northern* vote, struck out the clause allowing slavery; the *Senate* reinstated this clause, but on motion of Senator Thomas, of Illinois, inserted the 8th Section, prohibiting slavery in all the *other territory of Missouri*, *North of 36° 30'*, and allowing it in all south of that line. In the Senate, on the

first reading of the bill, the *Northern* vote for this *prohibition* was 20, and against it 2; but on the final motion to *admit* Missouri even with this *prohibition*, the North voted for it 4, *against it* 18; yet the motion prevailed, and the House and Senate agreed to admit Missouri as a slave State, and that in the remaining Missouri territory North of 36° 30', slavery should be prohibited. In the summer of 1820, Missouri complied with the formal conditions for her admission, but by a *Northern* vote of 93 to 79, she was *rejected*, under the *pretence* that her Constitution prohibited the introduction of *free* negroes, a clause similar to that then in the Constitutions of Ohio and other Northern States. Mr. Benton, (Vol. 1, p. 10.) says the North made this a *pretence*, but that their real object was to obtain the *balance of political power*.

In 1821, she again applied. On motion of Mr. Clay, a joint resolution was introduced to admit her, provided the free negro clause should not be held to prejudice the rights of any citizens of the United States; even to this the *North* objected, for on February 12, 1821, Mr. Mallory, of Vermont, moved to amend, that Missouri should be admitted under the so called Compromise of 1820, when she shall "*in addition to said provision, further provide in and by said Constitution, that neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude shall ever be allowed in said State of Missouri,*" &c., and 63 Northern men voted for this, and only 33 against it; thus the North again at the very time repudiated and refused to abide by this Compromise; yet the South aided by the Northern minority carried Mr. Clay's motion, and *not by any agreement with, but against the North*, enacted the line of 36° 30'.

In 1836, *Arkansas, South of 36° 30'*, asked to be admitted with slavery, as was her right under, this so called bargain; yet the Abolitionists opposed her. Mr. Cushing, of Massachusetts, said:—It is demanded of us—Do you seek to impose restrictions on Arkansas, in violation of the Compromise, under which Missouri entered the Union? I might content myself with replying that the State of Massachusetts was not a party to that Compromise. She never directly or indirectly assented to it. Those of her representatives who voted for it were disavowed and denounced at home."

Mr. Hand, of New York, said:—"I am aware it will be said, as it has already been contended, that by the *Missouri Compromise*, as it has been PREPOSTEROUSLY termed, Congress has parted with its right to prohibit the introduction of slavery into the territory *south of 36° 30' north latitude*. There are, to my mind, insuperable objections to that proposition. In the first place, there was no compromise or compact whereby Congress surrendered any power, or yielded any jurisdiction; and, in the second place, if it had done so, it was a mere legislative act, that could not bind their successors, it would be subject to a repeal at the will of any succeeding Congress."

With opinions like these, 54 northern members voted against her admission.

Thus at the first opportunity the Northern Free-Soilers again protested against, and refused to abide by, the Missouri Compromise.

In 1845, we acquired *Texas*, and to preserve the *principle* of the Missouri Compromise, Mr. Douglas moved, and Congress, by the third article, second section, adopted that line, prolonging it westward to the Rio del Norte, the

limit of Texas, and prohibiting slavery North of $36^{\circ} 30'$; but that the States, South of it should come in with or *without* slavery, as they chose. The Abolitionists voted *against* and did all they could to *prevent* this *extension of the Missouri Compromise line*—thus again repudiating that Compromise.

In 1847, during our war with Mexico, Congress voted \$3,000,000 to be used in negotiating a boundary between us and Mexico, upon which Mr. Wilmot moved a *proviso*, “*that no part of the territory to be acquired either South or North of $36^{\circ} 30'$ should be open to the introduction of slavery.*” “It,” (says Mr. Benton, vol. 2, p. 695) “*was a proposition not necessary for the purpose of excluding slavery.* * * The Proviso was nugatory, and could answer no purpose but that of bringing on a slavery agitation in the United States.” Mark! the Abolitionists did not propose to *abide by the principle of the Missouri line*, or to substitute for it any other Compromise. They required *exclusive control of all the territory*. This Proviso, however, was denounced by Webster, Clay, Cass, and others, and was voted down—but the Abolitionists were not.

In 1848, we acquired from Mexico the country West of Texas, and through to the Pacific. On motion of Mr. Douglas, the Senate voted to *extend the Compromise line* through to the Pacific Ocean—but the Abolitionists in the House defeated it. Thus, again, they violated that Compromise.

Oregon is North of 40° , and her inhabitants had prohibited slavery therein, and by her position, and by the will of her people, there was no occasion for Congress to interfere; yet in 1847, the Abolitionists in Congress insisted upon a clause in her territorial bill, prohibiting slavery therein; but to test the good faith of the Northern Abolitionists in abiding by the *Missouri Compromise line* of $36^{\circ} 30'$. Mr. Burt, of South Carolina, moved as an amendment to that clause in the bill which excluded slavery, these words: “*Inasmuch as the whole of said Territory lies North of $36^{\circ} 30'$ North latitude, known as the line of the Missouri Compromise.*” This was made to test whether the North considered that as the settled line of Compromise between free and slave territory; now mark the vote upon this in the House—82 voted for it, and all of them from the South except Douglas and Smith, from Illinois, Cunningham and Parish, from Ohio, C. J. Ingersoll, from Pennsylvania, and Hastings, from Iowa. One hundred and thirteen (and every one of them from the North,) voted *against* this motion to abide by the principle of the Missouri line. Thus, again, the South kept, and the North violated, the Missouri Compromise.

And the territorial bill for Oregon failed in 1847, because the Free-Soilers of the North would not suffer the Missouri Compromise to be introduced into it. In 1848; the Oregon bill was again before Congress, and on motion of Mr. Douglas, the Senate put in the following amendment:

“That the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ of North latitude, known as the Missouri Compromise line, as defined by the 8th section of an act entitled ‘An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit slavery in certain Territo-

ries,' approved March 6, 1820, be, and the same is hereby declared to extend to the Pacific Ocean; and the said eighth section, together with the Compromise therein effected, is hereby revived, and declared to be in full force, and binding for the future organization of the Territories of the United States, in the same sense and with the same understanding with which it was originally adopted."

In August, 1848, the House *rejected* this amendment; 82 voted for it, all being from the South except four, viz: Birdsall, of New York, Charles Brown, C. J. Ingersoll, and Brodhead, of Pennsylvania; and 121 (*and all from the North,*) voted *against* it. In the Senate, too, it received every Southern vote—even including Mr. Calhoun, who thereby conceded a principle he disapproved—while every *Northern* Senator (except five) voted against it. Thus the North again voted out this amendment, repudiated this Missouri line, and passed the bill without it.

President Polk signed the bill, though he disapproved of its principle. On March 7, 1850, Mr. Webster said this—"Mr. Polk was known to be in opinion *decidedly adverse* to the *Wilmot Proviso*; but he felt the necessity of establishing a Government for the Territory of Oregon, and, though the proviso was there, he knew it would be entirely nugatory; and since it must be nugatory—since it took away no right, no *describable*, no *estimable*, no *weighable* or *tangible right of the South*—he said he would sign the bill *for the sake of enacting a law to form a government in that territory.*" Had this bill taken away any "*tangible*" right of the *South* in that *Territory*, Mr. Webster admitted that Mr. Polk would *not* have signed the bill.

General Taylor, in his first message in 1849, recommended the admission of California, without any clause prohibiting slavery; and *New Mexico* and *Utah*, (without mixing the slavery question with their territorial governments,) were recommended to be left to ripen into States, and *then to settle that question for themselves in their Constitutions.*—(2 Benton, p. 741.) This the Abolitionist members of Congress *opposed*. The *South* desired to *extend the Missouri Compromise* line to the Pacific, and thus close the whole matter.

In 1847, Judge Dargan, a member from Alabama, said:—

"He had *not met with the first Southern man* who was not willing to *renew and continue that Compromise*. They did not ask it from any wish to obtain political ascendancy over the North, (as the latter did, says Mr. Benton, over the South,) or hope to control here, but from the condition of things around them. They ask their brethren of the North to renew the same agreement now, and they of the South would scrupulously fulfil it."

On January 29, 1850, Senator Davis, of Mississippi, said, (in speaking of the equal rights of the South to take their property into the territories:)

"It is a partial recognition of a right we claim to be co-extensive with the territories of the United States; but which *we are willing in a spirit of Compromise with the past acquiescence of the South, to restrict* by the parallel of 36° 30' North."

As still further proof of this spirit of the South, Mr. Atchison, on the 3rd

of January, 1850, read to the Senate the following solemn resolve of the Legislature of the State of Missouri :—

“*Resolved*, That the General Assembly regard the conduct of the Northern States on the subject of slavery, as releasing the slaveholding States from all further adherence to the basis of Compromise, fixed by the act of Congress of the 6th of March, 1820, even if such act ever did impose any obligation upon the slaveholding States, and authorize them to insist upon their rights under the Constitution; but for the sake of harmony, and for the preservation of our Federal Union, they will still sanction the application of the Missouri Compromise to the recent territorial acquisitions, if, by such concessions, future aggressions upon the equal rights of the States may be arrested, and the spirit of anti-slavery fanaticism be extinguished.”

The Abolitionists of the North again rejected this Compromise. In 1850, the contest provoked by the Abolitionists in Congress, became sectional and alarming. Yet the South, anxious to adhere to, and settle it upon the Missouri Compromise line, again, for the last time, offered it in the House on June 13, 1850, in these words :—

“Provided, however, that it shall be no objection to the admission into the Union of any State, which may hereafter be formed out of the territory lying south of the parallel of latitude of $36^{\circ} 30'$, that the Constitution of said State may authorize or establish African slavery therein.” This the Abolitionists rejected by 89 to 78, and two days after, a similar proposition was rejected in the Senate. That the Free-Soilers in the North *never assented to*, but *always repudiated* this Compromise, is expressly admitted by their leader, Senator Hale. In 1850, Mr. Douglas proposed to vary the boundary of UTAH, so as to include the Mormon settlements; and for that purpose to fix $36^{\circ} 30'$ as its southern boundary, not with a view at all to the question of slavery or to run that line to the Pacific, but simply for a local purpose; but even this Senator Hale and his coadjutors resisted, and he said :—

“I wish to say a word as a reason why I shall vote against the amendment. I shall vote against $36^{\circ} 30'$ *because I think there is an implication in it*. [Laughter.] I will vote for 37° or 36° either, just as it is convenient; but it is idle to shut our eyes to the fact that here is an attempt in this bill—I will not say it is the intention of the mover—to pledge this Senate and Congress to the imaginary line of $36^{\circ} 30'$, because there are some *historical recollections connected with it in regard to this controversy about slavery*. I will content myself with saying, that *I never will, by vote or speech, admit or submit to anything that may bind the action of our legislation here to make the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ the boundary line between slave and free territory*. And when I say that, I explain the reason why I go against the amendment.”

The North thus having repudiated the Missouri Compromise, the question then became an open one. As early as 1848, President Polk warned the Northern advocates of the Wilmot Proviso, that if the Missouri Compromise was not carried out in good faith, and according to the original understanding, it would soon become an open and original question; these were his

words in his last message to Congress: "But if Congress shall now reverse the decision, by which the Missouri Compromise was effected, and shall propose to extend the *restriction* over the *whole territory* south as well as north of the parallel of 36° 30', it WILL CEASE to be a *compromise*, and MUST BE REGARDED as an ORIGINAL QUESTION."

The North *did* then reverse and finally and forever repudiate the Missouri Compromise line.

The North refused to make *any division*, they claimed *all* the Territories. The South were willing to divide, but refused to be *entirely excluded*; and therefore *no course remained*, but to adopt the principle suggested by Gen. Taylor, *i. e.* that the people should decide the whole question for themselves. Nor was that a new principle. On it these Colonies were founded: to maintain it they revolted from Great Britain. They secured it under the old Confederation. Thus Pennsylvania reserved "to the people of the Colony, the *sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police of the same*;" and in acceding to the Declaration of Independence, she "provided that the *forming the government*, and the *regulation of the internal police thereof*, in this Colony, be always reserved to the people of the said Colony." And the other Colonies secured the same right. And the same has been repeatedly recognized as the right of the people of the Territories. Thus, in the admission of Arkansas as a slave State, Mr. Morris of Ohio, said: "Being one of the Representatives of a free State, and believing slavery to be wrong in principle and mischievous in practice, I wish to be clearly understood on the subject, here and elsewhere. I have objections to the Constitution of Arkansas, on the ground that slavery is recognized in that Constitution; * * * and I would vote against her admission as a member of this Union, if I believed I had the power to do so. * * * I hold that any portion of American citizens, who may reside on a portion of the territory of the United States, whenever their numbers shall amount to that which would entitle them to a representation in Congress, have the right to provide for themselves a Constitution and State Government, and to be admitted into the Union whenever they shall apply.

"The people of Arkansas have formed for themselves a State Government; * * * and believing that the people who prepared and sent the Constitution here, are sufficiently numerous to entitle them to a representation in Congress, and believing also, that Congress has no *right* or *power* to regulate the system of police, these people have established for themselves, and the Ordinance of 1787 not operating on them, nor have *they* entered into any agreement with the United States that slavery should not be admitted in their State, *they HAVE THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE this lot for themselves*, though, I regret that *they made this choice*." (1 Benton p. 630.)

On January 10, 1838, Mr. Calhoun's fifth resolution being under consideration, (the question being on an *amendment offered as a substitute by Mr. Clay*) was discussed to a late hour, and finally adopted, as *modified by Mr. Buchanan*, by a vote of 24 to 13.

The question was then taken on the adoption of the resolution as amended,

and passed by a vote of 36 to 8. This is the resolution, "*Resolved, That any attempt by Congress to abolish slavery in ANY Territory of the United States, in which it exists, would create serious alarm and just apprehension in the States sustaining that domestic institution, and would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants to any such Territory, who have been permitted to settle with and hold slaves therein; because the people of such Territories have not asked for the abolition of slavery therein, and because, when any such Territory shall be admitted into the Union as a State, the people thereof shall be entitled to decide that question EXCLUSIVELY for THEMSELVES.*"—(Congressional Globe, 1837-8, p. 91.)

The principle and the very words of the Democratic platform, were thus moved by Henry Clay in, and approved by, the Senate of the United States in 1838.

In the *Whig* Presidential Convention at Philadelphia, in 1848, Mr. Tilden of Ohio, offered this resolution:

"*Resolved, That while all power is denied to Congress under the Constitution to control, or in any way interfere, with the institution of slavery within the several States of the Union, it nevertheless has the power, and it is the duty of Congress to prohibit the introduction or existence of slavery in any Territory now possessed, or which may hereafter be acquired by the United States.*" The Convention refused even to entertain such a motion—they *laid it on the table.*

In 1850, Mr. Clay, again proposed to settle this slavery controversy on the same principle. In his speech of May 21st, 1850, he said: "I will close this part of what I have to say by grouping, comparing and contrasting the features of the respective plans of the Executive (President Fillmore) and the Committee, which I shall be glad if the reporter will publish in parallel column.

He (the President) propose *non-inter-*
vention as to slavery.

We (the Committee) also propose *non-*
intervention as to slavery.

And the Cincinnati platform prescribes:

"*Non-interference by Congress, with slavery in State and Territory or in the District of Columbia.*"

Mr. Clay had understood Senator Davis to *oppose* this principle of *non-interference*, and to require for the South, the *positive introduction* of slavery South of 36° 30'; and on January 29, 1850, he said, (what the Republicans habitually falsify,) "I am extremely sorry to hear the Senator from Mississippi say, ~~that~~ ^{there} requires, first, the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, and also that he is not satisfied with that, but requires, if I understood him correctly, a positive provision for the admission of slavery South of that line. And now, sir, coming from a slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to say that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a *specific measure*, for the *introduction* of slavery where it had not before existed, either South or North of that line. Coming as I do from a slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate and well matured determination, that no power, no earthly power shall compel me to

vote for the *positive introduction* of slavery, either South or North of that line. Sir, while you reproach, and justly too, our British ancestors for the introduction of this institution upon the Continent of America, I am, for one, unwilling that the posterity of the present inhabitants of California, and New Mexico shall reproach us, for doing just what we reproach Great Britain for doing to us. If the citizens of these Territories *choose* to establish slavery, and if they come here with Constitutions *establishing* slavery, I am for ~~ad-~~mitting them with such provisions in their Constitutions; but then it will be their own work, and not ours, and their posterity will have to reproach them, and not us, for forming Constitutions, allowing the institution of slavery to exist among them. These are my views, sir, and I choose to express them; and I care not how extensively or universally they are known."

"But, sir, I sincerely regret, as I have before stated, a discussion upon these resolutions at this time; for I could show, and at a proper time would show, that the proposition which I make of leaving the subject unacted upon, with regard to slavery, without any declaration either for or against it; leaving the question entirely open: I say, I could show that it is a much better proposition, as far as the interests of the South are concerned, than that of extending the Missouri line to the Pacific, unless you should couple with it that which the Senator from Mississippi knows to be impossible—a declaration or provision for the introduction of slavery South of that line."

"And I say, sir, in my place, that I consider it is much better for the South that the whole subject should be open on both sides of an imaginary line—for instance, the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ —than that slavery should be interdicted positively North of $36^{\circ} 30'$, with freedom to introduce or establish slavery South of that line, according to the will of the people."

These were the principles of Clay—on them he rested and sustained the Compromise of 1850, and that the Congress of the United States enacted, and the Whig and Democratic parties each solemnly resolved to abide by; and now the question is, shall the Abolitionists succeed in violating and repudiating that also, in like manner as they finally succeeded in destroying the Missouri Compromise of 1820.

2. All "opposed to the *extension* of slavery into free territory". This implies that the Democratic party of the Union *favor* the extension of slavery which is *not true*. They *deny* that the *government of the Union* or any *party* in the Union, can *extend* or *prohibit* slavery in any territory. They *affirm* that the *territories* are the *common property* of the *people of the several States*—that the *Federal Government* holds them in *trust only*—permit the *sons and daughters* of these *several and sovereign States*—their *true and only owners*—to *emigrate* into and *govern themselves* within such territories, just as in 1776 the people of the American Colonies contended they had the sole right to *govern themselves*. The English and Tories affirmed that because the Colonies were *territories*, and therefore the *property* of Great Britain, that she had a legal right to control the *domestic institutions* and *govern* the inhabitants of the Colonies. So, too, the Abolitionists affirm that because our territories are the *common property* of the *United States*, that therefore

the *Federal Congress*, like the British Parliament, can and ought to legislate in all cases whatsoever, for and even against the will of the American citizens who inhabit them. But Americans then denied to Great Britain, and claimed for *themselves* the *exclusive right of self-government*, and now the *Democratic party* deny to Congress, and claim for their *fellow-citizens of the territories* the *exclusive right of self-government*. It is for the American people now to choose between the Abolition party and British principle on the one side, and American principles sustained by the Democratic party on the other side.

3. "In favor of admitting Kansas as a free State." This implies that the *Democratic party*, is *opposed* to admitting Kansas a *free State*—that is *not true*. The Kansas Nebraska act, declares in the *very words* of the *Compromise Measures* of 1850, that, "when admitted as a State, the said Territory (*Kansas*,) or any portion of the same, *shall be received* into the Union, with or *WITHOUT* slavery, as their Constitutions, [made by their own inhabitants,] may prescribe at the time of their admission." The *Democratic party* wish the *bona fide* inhabitants to make a Constitution for, and to please *themselves*. The *Abolitionists* insist that the Constitution shall be made to please the *members of Congress*, and other Abolition constituents who do not and never intend to inhabit the territories. That is the difference between them.

4. "In favor of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the *principles* of Washington and Jefferson." The former declared that "the *basis* of our political system, is the right of the *people* to *MAKE* and alter their *Constitutions* of government." The Democratic party wish the *people* of *the territories* to make their *Constitution*; the Abolitionists wish the *members of Congress* to make it for them. He also declared, "In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as a matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical discriminations*—*Northern* and *Southern*, *Atlantic* and *Western*; whence *DESIGNING MEN* may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local influence and views." That is exactly what the Abolitionists are now doing. All their principles and practices rest on it. As to Jefferson, he said in a letter to John Holmes, dated MONTICELLO, April, 22, 1820:

"I thank you, dear sir, for the copy you have been so kind as to send me of the letter to your constituents on the Missouri question. It is a perfect justification of them. I had for a long time ceased to read newspapers, or pay any attention to public affairs, confident they were in good hands, and content to be a passenger in our bark to the shore from which I am not distant. But this momentous question, like a fire-bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. It is hushed, indeed, for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper. I can say, with conscious truth, that there is not a man on earth who would

sacrifice more than I would to relieve us from this heavy reproach, in any PRACTICABLE way. The cession of that kind of property—for it is so misnamed—is a bagatelle which would not cost me a second thought, if, in that way, a general emancipation and *expatriation* could be effected; and, gradually, and with due sacrifices, I think it might be. But as it is, we have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale, and self-preservation in the other. OF ONE THING I AM CERTAIN: that as the passage of slaves from one State to another would not make a slave of a single human being who would not be so without it, so their diffusion over a greater surface would make them individually happier, and proportionally facilitate the accomplishment of their emancipation, by dividing the number on a greater number of coadjutors. An abstinence, too, from this act of power would remove the jealousy excited by the undertaking of Congress to regulate the condition of the different descriptions of men composing a State. This certainly is the exclusive right of every State, which nothing in the Constitution has taken from them and given to the general government. Could Congress, for example, say that the non-freemen of Connecticut shall be freemen, or that they shall not emigrate into any other State?

“I regret that I am now to die in the belief that the useless sacrifice of themselves by the generation of 1776, to acquire self-government and happiness to their country, is to be thrown away by the UNWISE AND UNWORTHY PASSIONS OF THEIR SONS, and that my consolation is to be, that I live not to weep over it. If they would but dispassionately weigh the blessings they will throw away against AN ABSTRACT principle, more likely to be effected by union than by scission, they would pause before they would perpetrate this act of SUICIDE on themselves, and of TREASON against the hopes of the world. To yourself, as the faithful advocate of the Union, I tender the offering of my high esteem and respect.”

In a letter to Mr. Pinekney, (September 30, 1820,) Mr. Jefferson said, “THE MISSOURI QUESTION IS A MERE PARTY TRICK. The leaders of Federalism, defeated in their schemes of obtaining power by rallying partisans to the principle of monarchism—a principle of personal, not of local division—have changed their tack, and thrown out another barrel to the whale. They are taking advantage of the virtuous feelings of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line: they expect that this will insure them, on local principles, the majority they could never obtain on principles of Federalism; but they are still putting their shoulder to the wrong wheel; they are wasting Jeremiads on the miseries of slavery, as if we were advocates for it.”—(*Jefferson Papers*, Vol. VII. p. 180.) Again, in a letter to LAFAYETTE, (Dec. 26, 1820,) he said, “The boisterous sea of liberty, indeed, is never without a wave, and that from Missouri is now rolling towards us, but we shall ride over it, as we have over all others. It is not a moral question, but one merely of power. Its object is to raise a geographical principle for the choice of a President; and the noise will be kept up till that is effected.”

5-6. In some sections of the Union, and among certain classes of the peo-

ple, the Republicans are circulating their platform printed in *Boston*, by *John J. Jewett & Co.*; in *Cleveland, Ohio*, by *Sewell, Proctor & Worthington*, with the word "*grant*," instead of the word "*secure*." Thus they adopt the old Federal principle, that all power is *granted by Congress to the people*; there they *assume* that it is the first object of the Federal Government *not to secure*, but to *grant liberty to all* persons under its jurisdiction, and, of course, to *slaves*, as no others are deprived of liberty. Observe in connection with this, that there is *no clause in the platform* which *denies* the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the *States*, and it will be seen to involve the most radical abolitionism.

7. It is not true that slavery was abolished in *all* our territories. It was not abolished in that *South* of the Ohio, ceded by South Carolina August 9, 1787, and out of which and of that ceded by Georgia in 1802, the States of *Alabama* and *Mississippi* have been formed.

10. The Republicans in Philadelphia, and doubtless elsewhere, are circulating their platform with the whole of this clause *omitted*. Thus they make a platform of *principles*—then circulate some with a word fraudulently interpolated, in others they omit a whole clause; and, as by *Mr. Dunn's* bills, violate them all whenever it suits them.

11. The word "*sovereign*" is not to be found in the Constitution of the United States. Its framers reserved that to the States—they did not intend to delegate the power, and therefore did not use the word.

To justify the power of Congress to control the domestic institutions of the people in the territories, the Abolitionists add this word to the Constitution, and hence attributed *sovereignty* to *Congress* and *not* to the *people*, and thus as *Mr. Madison* said, subvert the most fundamental basis of political liberty. But as they concede that Congress has no power to legalize slavery, it cannot have *sovereign* power, which, in its very nature, is absolute.



